

## NOTES.

Metre *Wáfir*, as in No. III. The English follows the original measure, save in making the second hemistich catalectic.

Nuṣeyb was a negro slave, the property of a man who lived in Wâdi-l-Qurà, not far to the East of el-Medîneh. He covenanted with his master to buy his freedom (in Freytag's text, for *kânet 'alà nefsîhi*, read *kâtaba 'alà nefsîhi*), and having done so, repaired to the Khalîfeh 'Abd-el-'Azîz ibn Merwân, whom he praised in an ode. In requital therefor 'Abd-el-'Azîz gave him the purchase money wherewith to redeem himself, and gifts besides. He excelled in erotic and laudatory poetry.

v. 2. "A Qaṭà." The Qaṭà is the sand-grouse, a well-known bird of the Arabian Deserts, constantly recurring in old Arab poetry, and the subject of innumerable proverbial sayings.

*The revenues of the Mughal Empire in India.*—By EDWARD  
THOMAS, F. R. S., *Late Bengal C. S.*

Indian Numismatists are greatly indebted to Mr. C. J. Rodgers of Amritsar for his contributions of coins "supplementary to the Chronicles of the Pathán Kings of Dehli,"\* and for the careful illustration of the new specimens, by his own hand, which have lately appeared in our Journal.

In his last paper in Part I, Vol. XLIX, 1880, p. 213, on the "Copper coins of Akbar," Mr. Rodgers has entered into some speculations on the amount of the State Revenue of that monarch, based upon novel interpretations of the legends on the coins he describes, which seem to me to be open to criticism. I am the more bound to notice these readings and the deductions involved, as they touch a subject of much importance in the Fiscal history of India, which I have endeavoured to elucidate in a separate publication on the "Revenue resources of the Mughal Empire."†

I cannot claim that this work was received with much favour, on its first appearance, the returns contrasted so strikingly with the lesser totals obtained from the land in our day, that there was an intuitive tendency to suspect errors in my figures and calculations.‡ However, as Mr. W. W.

\* Trübner, London, 1871, 8vo., pp. xxiv. 467.

† Trübner, London, 1871, 8vo., pp. 54.

‡ Sir H. Elliot, one of our most experienced Settlement Officers under Martin Bird, in his investigation into the revenues past and recent of the province of Sind, was equally startled to find how little the British Government obtained from that fertile land, in comparison with the income of their Native predecessors. He remarks (p. 473, Vol. I, Dowson's Edit. *Historians of India*) "Under the Tâlpúrs \* \* Sind is said to have occasionally yielded £400,000; and under the Kalhoras, tradition represents the revenue at the exaggerated amount of £800,000. At present (A. D. 1855), with security on all its borders, and tranquillity within them, it does not pay to the British Government more than £300,000, and the expenses have hitherto been double that sum."

Hunter remarked in 1872.\* “Several attempts have been made in India to controvert Mr. Thomas’s figures, but so far without success.” And in his latest Lectures on “England’s work in India,”† the “Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India,” embodies them without question in his text, as a basis of comparison with the existing revenues of British India, and adds “indeed, the difficulty of a comparison has arisen not from the absence of information in respect to the Mughal revenues, but for want of exact statements regarding our own.”

Mr. Clements Markham, to whom H. M.’s Indian Government entrusted the task of compiling the successive Reports on the Indian Surveys, in like manner, seems to have fully satisfied himself as to the soundness of my data, which he quotes, in all faith, in his special notice of Akbar’s fiscal policy.‡

On the other hand, there have been criticisms and contentions enough, none of which seem to me to go so thoroughly into the details of a complicated subject, as to require more than a passing notice.§

I reproduce the general summary of the results obtained by me in 1871, from various and completely independent sources.

I have no wish whatever to claim for them finality, but they fall in epochally with probabilities, and I shall be the first to welcome any new lights, by whomsoever discovered.

\* Orissa. Smith, Elder and Co., 1872, Vol. II, p. 275.

† Smith, Elder, 1880, p. 104.

‡ Akbar, an Eastern Romance \* \* with notes and an introductory life of the Emperor Akbar by C. R. Markham, C. B., F. R. S. W. H. Allen and Co., 1879, pp. xxvi, xxxiii, and 106.

§ I scarcely know how to reply within reasonable space to Mr. H. G. Keene’s criticisms in his “Turks in India” (Allen, 1879), they are so discursive; but, the main point of difference between us seems to be the relative reliance to be placed on the returns of the *Ain-i-Akbari*, as against those of Nizám-ud-dín Ahmad. The former were avowedly progressive as new official details came in, and the grand total (in the case I examined) did not accord-with, or come-up-to the divisional totals embodied in the same schedule; the method of reckoning was also, to a certain extent, arbitrary, *i. e.*, by 40 *dáms* to the *rupee*, the latter a coin only recently introduced, and whose absolute divisional money representative, or  $\frac{1}{40}$ th *in copper*, is still a doubtful quantity. I may add, with reference to the *dám* of account, that Prof. Wilson in his Glossary of Indian terms, informs us that, the 40 *dáms* to the Rupee of Akbar’s time, came to be  $46\frac{1}{3}$ rd under ’Alamgír and even 80 to 90, at later periods. Whereas, on the other hand, Nizám-ud-dín, a master of finance, defined his returns in Sikandari *Tankas*, the current coin in which the Settlement of Sikandar Lodi had been framed. Mr. Keene, at p. ix, takes objection to my estimating the *rupee* at 2 shillings, this was merely done for facility of conversion, but every available testimony goes to prove that the exchange value of the fine silver *rupee* was, in those days, far higher than 2/.

RECAPITULATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE REVENUES OF THE MUGHAL  
EMPIRE AT VARIOUS PERIODS, WITH THE AUTHORITIES  
FOR THE RETURNS.

MUGHAL EMPERORS.	AUTHORITY.	Land Revenue.	Revenue from all sources.
1. Akbar, A.D. 1593 ..	Nizám-ud-dín Ahmad ..		£ 32,000,000
2. „ A.D. 1594 ..	Abúl Fazl, MSS. ....	£ 16,574,388	
3. „ „ ..	Official documents ....	16,582,440	
4. „ A.D. 1605 ..	Indian authorities quoted by De Laët ....	17,450,000	
5. Jahángír, A.D. 1609-11 ....	Captain W. Hawkins ..		50,000,000
6. „ A.D. 1628 ..	Abd ul Hamíd Láhóri..	17,500,000	
7. Sháh Jahán, A.D. 1648-9 .....	Ditto .....	22,000,000	
8. Aurangzéb, A.D. 1655	Official documents {	Gross, 26,743,970	
		Nett, 24,056,114	
	Later official documents* {	Gross, 35,641,431	
		Nett, 34,505,890	
9. „			80,000,000
10. „ A.D. 1695	Gemelli Careri .....		
11. „ A.D. 1697	Mannucci (Catron) ....	38,719,400 (× 2 =)	77,438,800
12. „ A.D. 1707	Ramusio .....	30,179,692	

Mr. Rodgers proposes to reduce by a summary process my total No. 1, of Nizám-ud-dín, from £32,000,000 to £3,200,000. The data for this alteration are, unfortunately for his argument, fundamentally erroneous. He has figured two coins of Akbar, in his Plates, bearing upon this division of his proofs.

No. 27 weighing 40 grains of copper, which he reads correctly as *دمري* (one) *damrí*. A second coin of a similar character No. 4, weighing 76 grains of copper, he reads incorrectly as *دام* *dám*, and he proposes to identify the coin as the representative of *the* *dám* or  $\frac{1}{40}$ th of the rupee of Akbar's revenue system.

I need scarcely follow his method of calculation whereby he seeks to justify the reduction above-named, as there is a much more simple way of disposing of the question. Tested by his own interpretation of the legend on No. 27, the letters on No. 4 can only be read as *دام* *damrá*,† *i. e.*, a double *damri*,‡ and have nothing whatever to do with the long-sought piece of the money of account.

His second basis of calculation depends on the import of the word he transcribes as *tánke*, inscribed on his coins Nos. 1, 2, 3. The definitions

\* 5 per cent., allowed for collection.

† The *final* *م* *mim*, on the Mughal coins is marked in its down stroke. This supposed *م* has a subjunct *e*.

‡ *دمري* *damri* from *द्रम* *dramma*,  $\frac{1}{8}$  of a paisa,—*دام* *damrá* gold, silver, riches. *द्रम* *dramma*, Gr. *δραχμή*.

of value on these pieces result in an average weight, in copper, of something over 55 grains. Mr. Rodgers thereupon proceeds to infer that as "the total revenues of Akbar are put down by Nizám-ud-dín at 640,00,00,000 tánkés. This at the rate of 200 to the rupee would be equal to 3,20,00,000 rupees or £3,200,000."

In this instance, also, the argument is founded on a palpable fallacy. There were both gold and silver *تَنكَه* *tankahs*\* which constituted the early currency of the Patháns, each of which were of the identical weight of 175 grains. But the *Tánk* (or *dáng*), as I was careful to point out (p. 408, my *Pathán Kings*), had nothing to do with the *Tankah*. I was also able to determine that the former was the surviving equivalent of the *Purána* of Manu, weighing 32 *Ratis* or 56 grains; in short the *دَانِق* (Arabic *دانق*) *dáng*, which Bábar himself remarked, was still used, in his days, to weigh "jewels and precious stones," and which he enters in his own Table of weights as equivalent to 32 *Ratis*.†

\* The Persian Historians designate the coins in these two metals as *Tankahs*. The word on the gold pieces is *سِكِّه* *Sikkah* in its generic sense.

† Leyden's *Memoirs of Bábar*, p. 332, *My Patháns*, p. 222.